

Computability of the packing measure of totally disconnected self-similar sets

Marta Llorente

Dpt. Análisis Económico: Economía cuantitativa,
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid,
Campus de Cantoblanco, 28049 Madrid
e-mail: m.llorente@uam.es

Manuel Morán

Dpt. Análisis Económico I,
Universidad Complutense de Madrid,
Campus de Somosaguas, 28223 Madrid
e-mail: mmoranca@ccee.ucm.es

April 29, 2014

Abstract

We present an algorithm to compute the exact value of the packing measure of self-similar sets satisfying the so called SSC and prove its convergence to the value of the packing measure. We also test the algorithm with examples that show both, the accuracy of the algorithm for the most regular cases and the possibility of using the additional information provided by it to obtain formulas for the packing measure of certain self-similar sets. For example, we are able to obtain a formula for the packing measure of any Sierpinski gasket with contraction factor in the interval $(0, 1/3]$ (Theorem 2).

1 Introduction and definitions

In this paper we deal with the problem of computing the value of the packing measure of (totally disconnected) self-similar sets, i.e., compact sets $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ that satisfy $E = \bigcup_{i=1}^N f_i(E)$ for some system $\Psi = \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_N\}$ of contracting similitudes on $\mathbb{R}^n$. The system Ψ is said to satisfy the *open set condition* (*OSC*) if there exists an open, non-empty, bounded subset $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\bigcup_i f_i \mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{O} \quad \text{and} \quad f_i \mathcal{O} \cap f_j \mathcal{O} = \emptyset \quad \forall i \neq j. \quad (1)$$

From now on we shall call *feasible open set* of the system Ψ (or of E) to any set $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying (1). The self-similar sets with separation conditions are probably the nowadays better understood fractal sets. For example, it is well known that the *similarity dimension* of E , i.e., the unique solution s of $\sum_{i=1}^N r_i^s = 1$, coincides with the most classical concepts of metric dimension such as the Hausdorff, packing or Minkowski dimension when the OSC is fulfilled. Associated to these dimensions we have the corresponding measures such as the Hausdorff, centered Hausdorff or packing measures (H^s , C^s and P^s , respectively). These metric measures are the appropriate tool to study the size of zero Lebesgue measure sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$, but in most cases they are hard to compute or estimate computationally. For example, under the OSC, the set E is easily seen to be an s -set, i.e., $0 < H^s(E) < \infty$ (the same inequality holds for C^s and P^s), but the problem of finding the precise value of any of these measures even for self similar sets remains as a challenging open problem. Many efforts has been done in this direction and the exact values or estimations for the lower and upper bounds of measures are known for some fractal sets (see [1]-[7], [8]-[10], [12, 16, 20] and the references therein). Particularly, in [2, 3, 4, 5, 7] and [16], the authors use the relation between the packing measure and the lower density to obtain formulas for the packing measure of some totally disconnected (but not necessarily self-similar) fractal sets. Namely, in these papers it holds that

$$P^s(A) = \left[\liminf_{d \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(B(x, d))}{(2d)^s} \right]^{-1} \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in A,$$

where μ is the natural uniformly distributed probability measure defined on $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Hence, in the mentioned papers, the problem of computing $P^s(A)$ is reduced to the problem of evaluating the lower density of μ . We

propose to tackle the problem of computing $P^s(E)$ from a different point of view. We continue here the development of the program on computability of metric measures on self-similar sets, whose foundations were laid in [12]. Following the lines developed in [10], where the same problem was considered for the centered Hausdorff measure, we are going to build an algorithm able to find the precise or approximate value of the packing measure of *totally disconnected self-similar sets* (see (9)). To this aim, the above lower density approach is not suitable as it involves measuring balls of arbitrarily small radii. However, we know by [8] and [19] that, in the totally disconnected case, it is not necessary to pass to the limit. In [12] it was proved that

$$P^s(E) = \sup \left\{ \frac{(2d)^s}{\mu(B(x, d))} : x \in E, B(x, d) \subset \mathcal{O} \right\}. \quad (2)$$

Using this fact, it is shown in [8, Theorem 3.3] that

$$P^s(E) = \max \left\{ h(x, d) : x \in E, \frac{r_{\min}}{2} \leq d \leq |E| \text{ and } B(x, d) \subset \mathcal{O} \right\} \quad (3)$$

(see Remark 3). Independently, Tricot [19, Theorem 10.1] proved a version of (3) where the condition $B(x, d) \subset \mathcal{O}$ is not needed (see (20)). Nevertheless, for numerical purposes, small balls yield problems such as rounding errors. Moreover, the present algorithm computes the value of $P^s(E)$ using approximations to the density functions $h(x, d)$ and it happens that the smaller the balls are the bigger the error in the numerical approximation of $h(x, d)$ is. Thus, we need to refine Tricot's formula so the balls to be explored are as large as possible. This is the content of our first theorem.

Theorem 1 *Assume that the system $\Psi = \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_N\}$ of contracting similitudes on $\mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies the SSC. Then, for any $a \in (0, \frac{c}{r_{\min}}]$*

$$P^s(E) = \max \{h(x, d) : x \in E, d \leq a\} = \quad (4)$$

$$= \max \{h(x, d) : x \in E, ar_{\min} \leq d \leq a\} \quad (5)$$

(see (9), (10) and (8) for notation).

We will prove Theorem 1 in Section 2. Section 3 is devoted to the construction of the packing measure algorithm built upon (5) and in Theorem 15 we manage to prove its convergence to $P^s(E)$. The structure of the algorithm

is based on the algorithm for the centered Hausdorff measure given in [10], however the extension of previous results is considerably more involved. The underlying reason is that, while in the centered Hausdorff measure case we could restrict the search of optimal balls to balls intersecting at least two different basic cylinder sets, the competing balls for the packing measure have radii in a certain closed interval and the nature of such an interval impedes the restriction to balls touching two different basic cylinder sets (see Section 4 for a detailed discussion). In order to prove Theorem 15, we need some results from [10] and some new lemmas which are proved at the beginning of the section. Finally, in Section 5, we test the efficiency of the algorithm as a tool to give the precise value of the packing measure when the contractio factors of the similitudes in Ψ are small enough. In this section we explain how the additional information provided by the algorithm (the so-called candidates for optimal balls) can be used to rigorously prove explicit formulae for the exact value of certain self similar sets. For illustration we collect here the case of the Sierpinski gasket. Let S_r be the *self-similar set*

associated to the system $\Psi = \{f_1, f_2, f_3\}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(\vec{x}) &= r\vec{x} \\ f_2(\vec{x}) &= r\vec{x} + (1-r, 0) \\ f_3(\vec{x}) &= r\vec{x} + (1-r)\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

$r \in (0, 1)$ and $\vec{x} = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. If $r \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, then S_r is a Sierpinski gasket satisfying the SSC. We shall denote by $s(r) = \frac{-\log 3}{\log r}$ to the similarity dimension of the set S_r . Our methods prove that,

Theorem 2 *If $r \in (0, \frac{1}{3}]$, then*

$$P^{s(r)}(S_r) = \left(2 \frac{1-r}{r}\right)^{s(r)}. \tag{7}$$

Theorem 2 extends the formula given by Taylor and Tricot in [16] for the case where all the contraction factors are equal to $\frac{1}{3}$. As an illustration we indicate at the end of this section how the algorithm together with the method used in the proof of (7) enable us to recover the known formulas for the value of the packing measure with an alternative proof. We also discuss the cases where the contractio ratios are not small enough to get precise values. Next,

we list the definitions and notation used throughout the paper. Given the system $\Psi = \{f_1, \dots, f_N\}$ of contracting similitudes on $\mathbb{R}^n$, we shall denote by $r_i \in (0, 1)$ the *similarity ratio* of $f_i \in \Psi$ and write

$$r_{\min} := \min_{i=1, \dots, N} r_i \quad \text{and} \quad r_{\max} := \max_{i=1, \dots, N} r_i. \quad (8)$$

The self-similar set E (associated to Ψ) is *totally disconnected* if

$$f_i(E) \cap f_j(E) = \emptyset \quad \forall i \neq j, i, j \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \quad (9)$$

this condition is known as *Strong Separation Condition* (SSC). We shall assume all the time SSC on the system Ψ and write

$$c := \min_{i, j \in \{1, \dots, N\}} d_{\inf}(f_i(E), f_j(E)) > 0, \quad (10)$$

where $d_{\inf}(f_i(E), f_j(E))$ is the distance that separates $f_i(E)$ and $f_j(E)$. Regarding the code space we shall keep the following notation. Let $M := \{1, \dots, N\}$ and

$$M^k = \{\mathbf{i}_k = (i_1, \dots, i_k) : i_j \in M \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, k\}.$$

Given $\mathbf{i}_k = i_1 i_2 \dots i_k \in M^k$, we shall write $f_{\mathbf{i}_k}$ for the similitude $f_{\mathbf{i}_k} = f_{i_1} \circ f_{i_2} \circ \dots \circ f_{i_k}$ with similarity ratio $r_{\mathbf{i}_k} = r_{i_1} r_{i_2} \dots r_{i_k}$ and given $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we shall denote by $A_{\mathbf{i}_k} = f_{\mathbf{i}_k}(A)$ and refer to the sets $E_{\mathbf{i}_k} = f_{\mathbf{i}_k}(E)$ as the *cylinder sets of generation k*. The self-similar set E can be written as the image of the *space of codes* $\mathbb{M} := M^\infty = M \times M \times \dots$ under the *projection mapping* $\pi : \mathbb{M} \rightarrow E$ given by

$$\pi(\mathbf{i}) = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} f_{\mathbf{i}(k)}(E) = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} E_{\mathbf{i}(k)} \quad (11)$$

where $\mathbf{i}(k)$ denotes the curtailment $i_1 \dots i_k \in M^k$ of $\mathbf{i}$ and $f_{\mathbf{i}(k)} = f_{i_1} \circ f_{i_2} \circ \dots \circ f_{i_k}$. We shall denote by μ the *natural probability measure*, or *normalized Hausdorff measure*, defined on the ring of cylinder sets by

$$\mu(E_{\mathbf{i}}) = r_{\mathbf{i}}^s, \quad (12)$$

and then extended to Borel subsets of E . Given $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we shall write $|A|$ for the diameter of A and for any $\delta \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $A_\delta = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \text{dist}(x, y) \leq \delta\}$ will be the δ -*parallel neighborhood* of A , where $\text{dist}(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the Euclidean distance. The closed ball centered at x and with radius $r > 0$ will be denoted by $B(x, r)$ and for the open ball we shall write $B'(x, r) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \text{dist}(x, y) < r\}$. Throughout the paper we shall assume without lost of generality that $R := |E| = 1$.

2 The packing measure of self-similar sets satisfying the SSC.

The *packing measures* were introduced by Tricot [17, 18], Taylor and Tricot [15, 16] and Sullivan [14], as the natural metric measure to analyze Brownian paths and limit sets of Kleinian groups. They are defined by a two-stage definition using efficient packings: first the *packing premeasure* is defined by

$$P_0^s(A) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} P_\delta^s(A) \quad (13)$$

where

$$P_\delta^s(A) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |B_i|^s : |B_i| \leq \delta, i = 1, 2, 3, \dots \right\} \quad (14)$$

is a non-decreasing set function with respect to δ and the supremum is taken over all δ -*packings* of A , i.e., countable collections of disjointed Euclidean balls centered at A and with diameter smaller than δ . The *packing measure* is then given by

$$P^s(A) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} P_0^s(U_i) : A \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} U_i \right\}. \quad (15)$$

However, this second step (15) may be omitted if the measured set is (as in our case) a compact set with finite packing premeasure (see [6]). Theorem 1, based on (2), gives an alternative characterization of the packing measure for self-similar sets satisfying the SSC more suitable to the computability problem. The main advantage of working with self-similar sets satisfying the SSC is that we can guarantee that the supremum in (2) is attained (see [8, Theorem 3.3] and [19, Theorem 10.1]).

Remark 3 *We want to clarify that the statement of [8, Theorem 3.3] contains a typo: $B(x, d) \subset \mathcal{O}$ is missing in the formula of the packing measure. The precise statement which was proved in [8] is*

$$P^s(E) = \sup \left\{ \frac{(2d)^s}{\mu(B(x, d))} : x \in E, \frac{r_{\min}}{2} \leq d \leq |E| \text{ and } B(x, d) \subset \mathcal{O} \right\}.$$

A further advantage of Theorem 1 is that we are able to get rid of the condition $B(x, d) \subset \mathcal{O}$ at the same time that we constrain the set of balls

where the supremum is to be obtained to balls having radii on a closed interval bounded away from zero. These results are possible due to the invariance of the *density function*

$$h(x, d) := \frac{(2d)^s}{\mu(B(x, d))}$$

under certain inverse images of the similarity functions of the system Ψ . We recall this fact widely used throughout the paper.

Lemma 4 *Let $(x, d) \in E \times \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{M}$ with $\pi(\mathbf{i}) = x$.*

i) *If $B'(x, d) \cap E \subset E_{\mathbf{i}(k)}$, then*

$$h(x, d) = h(f_{\mathbf{i}(k)}^{-1}(x), \frac{d}{r_{\mathbf{i}(k)}}). \quad (16)$$

ii) *Assume that for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $d \leq cr_{\mathbf{i}(k)}$ holds, with $r_{\mathbf{i}(k)} = 1$ if $k = 0$. Then*

$$h(x, d) = h(f_{\mathbf{i}(k+1)}^{-1}(x), \frac{d}{r_{\mathbf{i}(k+1)}}). \quad (17)$$

iii) *Let $i \in M$ be such that $r_i = r_{\min}$ and suppose that $d \leq \frac{c}{r_{\min}}$. Then*

$$h(x, d) = h(f_i(x), dr_i) \quad (18)$$

Proof. In the situation of *i)* we may write

$$f_{\mathbf{i}(k)}^{-1}(B'(x, d) \cap E) = f_{\mathbf{i}(k)}^{-1}(B'(x, d) \cap E_{\mathbf{i}(k)}) = B'(f_{\mathbf{i}(k)}^{-1}(x), \frac{d}{r_{\mathbf{i}(k)}}) \cap E.$$

Then, (16) holds because, by [11], we know that the boundary of any given ball is a μ -null set (see Remark 3.2 in [8]). Assume now that $d \leq cr_{\mathbf{i}(k)}$. If

$$B'(x, d) \cap E \subset E_{\mathbf{i}(k+1)}, \quad (19)$$

then (17) holds trivially from *i)*. So we need only to show that (19) holds if $d \leq cr_{\mathbf{i}(k)}$. Assume, on the contrary, that there exists $y \in E \cap B'(x, d) \setminus E_{\mathbf{i}(k+1)}$ and let $q = \max \{l : \mathbf{j}(l) = \mathbf{i}(l)\}$ where $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{M}$ is such that $\pi(\mathbf{j}) = y$. Then, $q \leq k$, $f_{\mathbf{j}(q)}^{-1}(y) \in E_{\mathbf{j}(q+1)}$, $f_{\mathbf{i}(q)}^{-1}(x) \in E_{\mathbf{i}(q+1)}$ with $\mathbf{j}(q+1) \neq \mathbf{i}(q+1)$ and

$$\text{dist}(f_{\mathbf{i}(q)}^{-1}(x), f_{\mathbf{j}(q)}^{-1}(y)) = r_{\mathbf{i}(q)}^{-1} \text{dist}(x, y)$$

with $f_{i(q)}^{-1} = f_{j(q)}^{-1}$ and $r_{i(q)}^{-1} = 1$ if $q = 0$. Therefore,

$$d > \text{dist}(x, y) = \text{dist}(f_{j(q)}^{-1}(y), f_{i(q)}^{-1}(x))r_{i(q)} \geq cr_{i(q)} \geq cr_{i(k)},$$

giving the desired contradiction. This shows (19) and concludes the proof of *ii*). Lastly, if $(x, d) \in E \times \mathbb{R}^+$ with $d \leq \frac{c}{r_{\min}}$ and $r_i = r_{\min}$, then $B'(f_i(x), dr_i) \subset (E_i)_c$ and $(E_i)_c \cap E = E_i$, so we may write

$$\begin{aligned} f_i(B'(x, d) \cap E) &= B'(f_i(x), dr_i) \cap E_i = \\ &= B'(f_i(x), dr_i) \cap (E_i)_c \cap E = B'(f_i(x), dr_i) \cap E \end{aligned}$$

and *iii*) follows. ■

Now we turn to the proof of Theorem 1 whose aim is a reduction of the set of balls where the supremum in (2) is to be computed. From a computational point of view this reduction is more efficient if the balls to be explored are larger, so the idea is to seek the largest possible balls which still give the packing measure. In [19, Theorem 10.1], Tricot obtained the following result in this direction: "If E is totally disconnected then

$$P_0^s E = P^s E = \frac{1}{m} \quad (20)$$

where $m = \inf I_E$ with $I_E = \left\{ \frac{\mu(B(x, d))}{(2d)^s} : x \in E, \frac{r_{\min}}{r_{\max}}c \leq d \leq \frac{1}{r_{\max}}c \right\}$. Theorem 1 is an extension of Tricot's result more suitable to our purposes and proved with different arguments.

Proof of Theorem 1. For $\delta > 0$, let $\mathcal{A}(\delta) := \{(x, d) : x \in E, 0 < d \leq \delta\}$ and let $S(\delta) := \sup \{h(x, d) : (x, d) \in \mathcal{A}(\delta)\}$. Consider also

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(\delta_1, \delta_2) &:= \{(x, d) : x \in E, \delta_1 \leq d \leq \delta_2\} \quad \text{and} \\ S(\delta_1, \delta_2) &:= \sup \{h(x, d) : (x, d) \in \mathcal{A}(\delta_1, \delta_2)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $a, b \in (0, \frac{c}{r_{\min}}]$ and suppose without loss of generality that $b < a$. We are going to show first that

$$S(a) = S(b). \quad (21)$$

Notice that, if $a \in (0, \frac{c}{r_{\min}}]$, (18) implies

$$S(a) \leq S(ar_{\min}).$$

The opposite inequality also holds as $\mathcal{A}(ar_{\min}) \subset \mathcal{A}(a)$. Thus, for any $a \in (0, \frac{c}{r_{\min}}]$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we have

$$S(a) = S(ar_{\min}) = S(ar_{\min}^k). \quad (22)$$

This shows that, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ such that $ar_{\min}^k < b$, $S(b) \leq S(a) = S(ar_{\min}^k) \leq S(b)$ whence

$$S(b) = S(a),$$

concluding the proof of (21). Now take $(x, d) \in \mathcal{A}(b)$ and let $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{M}$ be such that $\pi(\mathbf{i}) = x$ and $k := \min \left\{ l \in \mathbb{N} : \frac{d}{r_{\mathbf{i}(l)}} \geq ar_{\min} \right\}$. Then,

$$ar_{\min} \leq \frac{d}{r_{\mathbf{i}(k)}} \leq \frac{d}{r_{\mathbf{i}(k-1)} r_{\min}} < a \leq \frac{c}{r_{\min}},$$

where the first and the third inequalities hold by the selection of k . This shows that $(f_{\mathbf{i}(k)}^{-1}(x), \frac{d}{r_{\mathbf{i}(k)}}) \in \mathcal{A}(ar_{\min}, a)$. Moreover, since $d \leq cr_{\mathbf{i}(k-1)}$, part *ii*) of Lemma 4 implies that $h(f_{\mathbf{i}(k)}^{-1}(x), \frac{d}{r_{\mathbf{i}(k)}}) = h(x, d)$ and, by (21), we obtain

$$S(b) \leq S(ar_{\min}, a) \leq S(a) = S(b)$$

that is

$$S(a) = S(b) = S(ar_{\min}, a) \quad (23)$$

for any $a, b \in (0, \frac{c}{r_{\min}}]$. Lastly we prove that $P^s(E) = S(ar_{\min}, a)$. To this end, let $k := \min \{ l \in \mathbb{N}^+ : 2r_{\max}^k + cr_{\min}^k \leq c \}$ and take two feasible open sets for E , namely $\mathcal{O}_1 = (E)_{\frac{c}{2}}$ and $\mathcal{O}_2 = (E)_{r_{\min}^k \frac{c}{2}}$. On one hand, (23) with $b = \frac{c}{2}$ together with (2) applied to $\mathcal{O}_1$ give

$$P^s(E) \geq S(\frac{c}{2}) = S(ar_{\min}, a). \quad (24)$$

On the other hand, the connectivity of the Euclidean balls, imply that any $B(x, d) \subset \mathcal{O}_2$ with $x \in E_{\mathbf{i}(k)}$ must be contained in some $(E_i)_{r_{\min}^k \frac{c}{2}}, i \in M$, so it must verify that

$$d \leq |E_{\mathbf{i}(k)}| + \frac{c}{2} r_{\min}^k \leq r_{\max}^k + \frac{c}{2} r_{\min}^k.$$

Hence, if we apply (2) to $\mathcal{O}_2$, (24) implies that

$$S(ar_{\min}, a) \leq P^s(E) \leq S(r_{\max}^k + \frac{c}{2} r_{\min}^k) \leq S(\frac{c}{2}) = S(ar_{\min}, a)$$

which shows the desired equality. Notice that, since the μ -measure of boundaries of balls is null, h is a continuous function in $E \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and the supremum in the definition of $S(ar_{\min}, a)$ is attained (the set $\mathcal{A}(ar_{\min}, a)$ is compact), this observation ends the proof of the theorem. ■

The following lemma will allow us to narrow the search for optimal balls to those whose boundary intersects E (see also Corollary 8).

Lemma 5 *Let $a \in (0, \frac{c}{r_{\min}}]$ and $(x_0, d_0) \in E \times [ar_{\min}, a]$ be such that*

$$P^s(E) = h(x_0, d_0) = \frac{(2d_0)^s}{\mu(B(x_0, d_0))}. \quad (25)$$

Then, either $d_0 = a$ or

$$\partial B(x_0, d_0) \cap E \neq \emptyset. \quad (26)$$

Proof. Let $(x_0, d_0) \in E \times [ar_{\min}, a]$ satisfying (25) and let $\mathbf{i} = i_1 i_2 \dots \in \mathbb{M}$ be such that $\pi(\mathbf{i}) = x_0$. Suppose on the contrary that $\partial B(x_0, d_0) \cap E = \emptyset$ and $d_0 < a$. Then, there exists $d' > d_0$ such that $ar_{\min} \leq d' \leq a$ and

$$(B(x_0, d') \setminus B(x_0, d_0)) \cap E = \emptyset.$$

Whence, $\mu(B(x_0, d_0)) = \mu(B(x_0, d'))$ contradicting the maximality of (x_0, d_0) (see (5)). ■

Remark 6 *Observe that the case $d_0 = a$ in Lemma 5 might be omitted, this is because (18) implies that for any $x \in E$,*

$$h(x, a) = h(f_i(x), ar_{\min})$$

where $i \in M$ is such that $r_{\min} = r_i$.

Two straightforward consequences of the above remark are the following corollaries to Theorem 1 and Lemma 5, respectively.

Corollary 7 *Under the conditions of Theorem 1,*

$$P^s(E) = \max\{h(x, d) : x \in E \text{ and } d \in [ar_{\min}, a]\}.$$

Corollary 8 *For any $a \in (0, \frac{c}{r_{\min}}]$ there exists $(x_0, d_0) \in E \times [ar_{\min}, a)$ such that*

$$P^s(E) = h(x_0, d_0)$$

and

$$\partial B(x_0, d_0) \cap E \neq \emptyset.$$

It is useful to note that, for any pair $(x_0, d_0) \in E \times [ar_{\min}, a)$ satisfying (25), Corollary 8 guarantees the existence of a point $y \in E$ such that

$$P^s(E) = \frac{(2d_0)^s}{\mu(B(x_0, d_0))} = \frac{(2\text{dist}(x_0, y))^s}{\mu(B(x_0, \text{dist}(x_0, y)))}. \quad (27)$$

3 Description of the algorithm

This section is devoted to describe an algorithm to compute the packing measure of self-similar sets satisfying the SSC. We recall that, for this particular class of self-similar sets, the packing measure can be defined as

$$P^s(E) = \max \{h(x, d) : x \in E, ar_{\min} \leq d \leq a\} \quad (28)$$

where a is any real number within the interval $(0, \frac{c}{r_{\min}}]$ (see Theorem 1). Our method is strongly based on (28) as, to find the value of $P^s(E)$, we construct an algorithm for maximizing the value of

$$h(x, d) = \frac{(2d)^s}{\mu(B(x, d))} \quad (29)$$

when $x \in E$ and $\tilde{c} \leq d \leq \frac{\tilde{c}}{r_{\min}}$, where $\tilde{c}$ is an estimate of c . The idea is to estimate c with $\tilde{c}$ and construct sequences $\{A_k\}$ of finite sets and $\{\mu_k\}$ of discrete measures supported on A_k such that $\overline{\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k} = E$ and $\{\mu_k\}$ converges weakly to μ . $\overline{A}$ stands for the closure of A . This allows us to construct another sequence $\{\tilde{m}_k\}$ converging to $P^s(E)$ by choosing on each step k , a pair $(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{y}_k) \in A_k \times A_k$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{m}_k &:= h_k(\tilde{x}_k, \text{dist}(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{y}_k)) = \\ &= \max \{h_k(x, \text{dist}(x, y)) : (x, y) \in A_k \times A_k \text{ and } \tilde{c} \leq \text{dist}(x, y) \leq \frac{\tilde{c}}{r_{\min}}\}, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where $h_k(x, d) := \frac{(2d)^s}{\mu_k(B'(x, d))}$.

Remark 9 Notice that the definition of the discrete density function $h_k(x, r)$ uses open balls rather than the closed balls used in the continuous version $h(x, d)$. Actually, since $\mu(\partial B(x, d)) = 0$ (see ([11])), it is also possible to use open balls in (29). The situation with $h_k(x, d)$ is slightly different. Either the

use of open or closed balls in the definition of $h_k(x, d)$ leads to a convergent algorithm, but the numerics have proved that for the packing measure is more convenient to use open balls while, in the centered Hausdorff measure case, closed balls were more adequate. The difference between these two cases relies on the nature of the candidates to optimal balls: in the first case they have to be as emptiest as possible while in the present case, the fuller the better.

3.1 Homogeneous case ($r_i = r \ \forall i \in M$)

Next, we describe the algorithm for self-similar sets where all the contraction ratios coincide as this case illustrates better the central idea of the construction. Afterwards, we shall explain in Section 3.2 the modifications needed to treat the case of unequal similarity ratios. Observe that if $r_i = r_j := r \ \forall i \neq j$, the invariant measure μ satisfies that

$$\mu(E_{\mathbf{i}_k}) = r^{ks} = \frac{1}{m^k} \quad \forall \mathbf{i}_k \in M^k. \quad (31)$$

Algorithm 10 (*Homogeneous case: $r_i = r_j := r \ \forall i \neq j, i, j \in M$*) Input of the Algorithm: *System of contracting similitudes, $k_{\max}$ (the number of iterations), $\tilde{k}$ and $N \geq 2$ (see step 3).*

1. **Construction of A_k .** Let $A_1 = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}$ be the set of the fixed points for the similitudes in Ψ , that is, for every $i \in M$, $f_i(x_i) = x_i$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, let $A_k = S\Psi(A_{k-1})$ be the set of m^k points obtained by applying $S\Psi(x) = \bigcup_{i \in M} f_i(x)$ to each of the m^{k-1} points of A_{k-1} .

Notation 11 For every $x \in A_k$ we shall denote by $\mathbf{i}_k(x) = i_1(x) \dots i_k(x) \in M^k$ the unique sequence of length k such that $x = f_{\mathbf{i}_k(x)}(y)$ for some $y \in A_1$ and we shall write x as $x_{\mathbf{i}_k(x)}$. Note that, in this case, $y = f_{i_k(x)}(y)$ and that $x \in A_k \setminus A_{k-1} \iff i_k(x) \neq i_{k-1}(x)$.

2. **List of distances.** This step consists on computing the set

$$\Delta_k := \{ \text{dist}(x, y) : (x, y) \in A_k \times A_k \}$$

of distances between the pairs of points in $A_k \times A_k$. It is important to notice that $\Delta_{k-1} \subset \Delta_k$ since $A_{k-1} \subset A_k$ (see Lemma 18 (ii)). It is

then clear that, in order to construct Δ_k , there is not need to compute again the distances already computed in Δ_{k-1} , so we calculate only the distances $\text{dist}(x, y)$ between those points $(x, y) \in A_k \times A_k$ satisfying that

$$i_k(x) \neq i_{k-1}(x) \text{ or } i_k(y) \neq i_{k-1}(y)$$

(see Notation 11). For every $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, let us denote by Δ_k^0 the set of all these distances and set $\Delta_k = \Delta_k^0 \cup \Delta_{k-1}$, with $\Delta_1 = \Delta_1^0 = \{\text{dist}(x, y) : (x, y) \in A_1 \times A_1\}$. Observe that

$$\Delta_k^0 := \{\text{dist}(x, y) : x, y \in A_k\} \setminus \Delta_{k-1}.$$

From now on we assign the code $(\mathbf{i}_k(x), \mathbf{i}_k(y))$ to each $\text{dist}(x, y) \in \Delta_k$ and refer to $(\mathbf{i}_k(x), \mathbf{i}_k(y))$ as the k -address of $\text{dist}(x, y)$. Notice that if $\text{dist}(x, y) \in \Delta_k$, its $(k+1)$ -address will be

$$(\mathbf{i}_k(x)i_k, \mathbf{i}_k(y)i_k(y)) = (i_1(x) \dots i_k(x)i_k(x), i_1(y) \dots i_k(y)i_k(y)).$$

3. **Estimation of c by $\tilde{c}$.** Let $c_0 := \min\{\text{dist}(x, y) \in \Delta_1 : x \neq y\}$. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\tilde{c}_k := c_k - 2r^k \tag{32}$$

where

$$c_k := \min\{c_{k-1}, c'_k\}$$

and

$$c'_k = \min\{\text{dist}(x, y) \in \Delta_k^0 : i_1(x) \neq i_1(y)\}.$$

Notice that

$$\tilde{c}_k = \min_{i, j \in M} \{\text{dist}(f_i(A_{k-1}), f_j(A_{k-1})) : i \neq j\} - 2r^k.$$

We define

$$\tilde{c} := \tilde{c}_{\tilde{k}} \tag{33}$$

where $\tilde{k}$ is the biggest $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ allowed by the computer capacity such that $\tilde{c}_k > 0$.

Remark 12 In many examples and, in particular, when all the similitudes in Ψ are homotheties, the above approximation of c by $\tilde{c}$ is not needed because the minimal distance between basic cylinder sets is known. In these cases, the present step should be replaced with the value of c in the construction of the algorithm. It is easy to see that Theorem 15 also holds if c is replaced with $\tilde{c}$ in the construction of the sequence $\{\tilde{m}_k\}$.

4. **Construction of μ_k .** For all $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, set

$$\mu_k(x) = \frac{1}{m^k} \quad \forall x \in A_k. \quad (34)$$

Thus,

$$\mu_k = \frac{1}{m^k} \sum_{i=1}^{m^k} \delta_{x_i}$$

is a probability measure with $\text{spt}(\mu_k) = A_k = \{x_1, \dots, x_{m^k}\}$.

5. **Construction of $\tilde{m}_k$** Given $x \in A_k$:

5.1 Arrange in increasing order the distances $d \in \Delta_k$ containing $\mathbf{i}_k(x)$ in their addresses and such that $d \leq \frac{\tilde{c}}{r}$.

5.2 Let $L(x) := \{d_0, d_1, \dots, d_{p(x)}\}$ with $0 \leq p(x) \leq m^k - 1$, be the list of ordered distances. For each $j = 0, \dots, p(x)$, $B'(x, d_j)$ contains $j - t(j)$ points of A_k , where $t(j) = \#\{l < j : d_l = d_j\}$, therefore

$$\mu_k(B(x, d_j)) = \frac{j - t(j)}{m^k}. \quad (35)$$

Compute

$$h_k(x, d_j) := \frac{(2d_j)^s}{\mu_k(B(x, d_j))} = \frac{(2d_j)^s}{\frac{j-t(j)}{m^k}} = \frac{m^k (2d_j)^s}{j - t(j)} \quad (36)$$

only for those distances $d_j \in L(x)$ satisfying that

$$\tilde{c} \leq d_j.$$

5.3 Find the maximum, $m_k(x)$, of the values computed in the step 5.2.

5.4 Repeat steps 5.1-5.3 for each $x \in A_k$.

5.5 Take the maximum,

$$\tilde{m}_k := \max\{m_k(x) : x \in A_k\}$$

of the m^k values computed in step 5.4.

6. If $k = k_{\max}$ end the program. If $k < k_{\max}$ let $k = k + 1$ and go to step 1.

We recall again the importance from the computational point of view of reducing the set of balls where the supremum is to be computed. Moreover, these balls should be as large as possible. This is the reason to build the algorithm upon the formula

$$P^s(E) = \max \left\{ h(x, d) : (x, d) \in E \times \left[c, \frac{c}{r_{\min}} \right] \right\}. \quad (37)$$

Notice that, for every $x \in A_k$, the algorithm finds the maximum value of $h_k(x, d_j)$ only for those pairs $(x, d_j) \in A_k \times L(x)$ such that

$$d_j \in \left[\tilde{c}, \frac{\tilde{c}}{r_{\min}} \right] = \left[\tilde{c}, \frac{\tilde{c}}{r} \right]. \quad (38)$$

3.2 General case ($r_i \neq r_j$)

Next we list the changes needed to build the algorithm when the contraction ratios are unequal. The main difference with the previous case is the value assigned to the measures μ_k . The structure of the algorithm is the same in either case.

1. In step 3, replace (32) with

$$\tilde{c}_k := c_k - 2r_{\max}^k. \quad (39)$$

2. In step 4, replace (34) with

$$\mu_k(x) = r_{\mathbf{i}_k(x)}^s \quad \forall x \in A_k, \quad (40)$$

(see Notation 11). Consequently, μ_k is a probability measure with $\text{spt}(\mu_k) = A_k = \{x_1, \dots, x_{m^k}\}$ given by

$$\mu_k = \sum_{j=1}^{m^k} r_{\mathbf{i}_k(x_j)}^s \delta_{x_j}. \quad (41)$$

3. In step 5.1 write $d \leq \frac{\tilde{c}}{r_{\min}}$ instead of $d \leq \frac{\tilde{c}}{r}$.
4. In step 5.2, replace (35) with

$$\mu_k(B'(x, d_j)) = \sum_{q=0}^{j-t(j)-1} r_{\mathbf{i}_k(x_{i_q})}^s, \quad (42)$$

where $x_{i_q} \in A_k$ is such that $d_q = \text{dist}(x, x_{i_q}) < d_j$ for all $q = 0, \dots, j - t(j) - 1$. Observe that $\mu_k(B'(x, d_0)) = 0$ as $x = x_{i_0}$ in every case. Replace also (36) with

$$h_k(x, d_j) := \frac{(2d_j)^s}{\mu_k(B'(x, d_j))} = \frac{(2d_j)^s}{\sum_{q=0}^{j-t(j)-1} r_{\mathbf{i}_k(x_{i_q})}^s}. \quad (43)$$

Observe that the last equality in (38) does not hold in this general case.

Remark 13 Since $|E| = 1$ and for every $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $E \subset (A_k)_{r_{\max}^k} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \text{dist}(x, A_k) \leq r_{\max}^k\}$, we have that

$$c_k - 2r_{\max}^k \leq c$$

and thus

$$c - 2r_{\max}^{\tilde{k}} \leq \tilde{c} \leq c \quad (44)$$

(see (33) for notation). Hence, by (28)

$$P^s(E) = \max\{h(x, d) : (x, d) \in E \times [\tilde{c}, \frac{\tilde{c}}{r_{\min}}]\}. \quad (45)$$

Notation 14 For the rest of the paper we shall keep the following notation. Let $A_k = S\Psi(A_{k-1})$ be the set of m^k points obtained after k iterations with $A_1 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f_i(x) = x, i = 1, \dots, m\}$, we write

$$A := \cup_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k.$$

Given $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $x \in A_k$, let D_k^x be the set of distances satisfying condition (38), we denote by

$$D_k := \cup_{x \in A_k} D_k^x$$

and we write

$$D := \cup_{k=0}^{\infty} D_k.$$

Observe that (38) implies that D_k and D only take values in the interval $[\tilde{c}, \frac{\tilde{c}}{r_{\min}}]$. Under this notation the sequence $\tilde{m}_k$ computed in step 5.5 can be written as

$$\tilde{m}_k := h_k(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k) := \frac{(2\tilde{d}_k)^s}{\mu_k(B'(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k))} = \max\{h_k(x, d) : (x, d) \in A_k \times D_k\}.$$

We shall refer to the sequence $\{(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k)\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ as the (optimal) algorithm sequence.

4 Convergence of the algorithm

In this section we show the convergence of the *algorithm sequence* $\{\tilde{m}_k\}$. This is stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 15 *The algorithm sequence $\{\tilde{m}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ given by (47) converges to $P^s(E)$. Moreover, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ such that $\mu_k(B'(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k)) = \mu(B(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k))$,*

$$P^s(E) \geq \tilde{m}_k. \quad (46)$$

The proof of Theorem 15 is postponed to the end of the section. It will follow the structure of the proof given in [9], where equivalent results were obtained for the centered Hausdorff measure. However, the case of the packing measure is structurally more difficult. On one hand, the value of the centered Hausdorff measure was found as the maximum of the densities of balls intersecting at least two different basic cylinder sets. This is not the case of the packing measure since the balls upon which we seek the minimum value have radii bounded between $\tilde{c}$ and $\frac{\tilde{c}}{r_{\min}} < \frac{c}{r_{\min}}$. This means that we cannot restrict to balls touching two different basic cylinder sets since the radii these balls might be bigger than $\frac{c}{r_{\min}}$ if some of the contractio factors of the similarities are bigger than c . A preliminary step will be to show the existence of a sequence $\{(x_k, d_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ in $A_k \times [\tilde{c}, \frac{\tilde{c}}{r_{\min}}]$ such that

$$m_k := h_k(x_k, d_k) := \frac{(2d_k)^s}{\mu_k(B'(x_k, d_k))} \rightarrow P^s(E).$$

This is done in Lemma 19. It is important to notice that, although Lemma 19 guarantees the existence of a nice sequence $\{m_k\}$ converging to $P^s(E)$, there is a priory no reason for this sequence to coincide with the *algorithm sequence* $\{\tilde{m}_k\}$. The algorithm selects its own sequence $\{\tilde{m}_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ by choosing on each step k , those pairs $(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k) \in A_k \times D_k \subset A_k \times [\tilde{c}, \frac{\tilde{c}}{r_{\min}}]$ satisfying

$$\tilde{m}_k := h_k(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k) := \frac{(2\tilde{d}_k)^s}{\mu_k(B'(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k))} = \max\{h_k(x, d) : (x, d) \in A_k \times D_k\}, \quad (47)$$

and even if $\{m_k\}$ and $\{\tilde{m}_k\}$ coincide, $B'(x_k, d_k)$ and $B'(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k)$ might be different. Actually, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ there could be more than one pair $(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k)$ satisfying (47). However, an important feature of the algorithm is that, in many cases, it gives the candidate to optimal ball. At the end of the

section we shall prove that the sequence of maximal values $\{\tilde{m}_k\}$ converges to the maximum $P^s(E)$ (see Theorem 15). We shall need the following result from [9] to show the existence of the sequences given in Lemma 19.

Theorem 16 ([9] Theorem 4.9) *Let $x_0, y_0 \in E$ with $x_0 \neq y_0$ and let $d_0 = \text{dist}(x_0, y_0)$. If the sequences $\{x_k\}$, $\{y_k\}$ are such that $x_k, y_k \in A_k$ $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $x_k \rightarrow x_0$ and $y_k \rightarrow y_0$, then $d_k := \text{dist}(x_k, y_k) \rightarrow d_0$ and*

$$m_k := \frac{(2d_k)^s}{\mu_k(B'(x_k, d_k))} \rightarrow \frac{(2d_0)^s}{\mu(B(x_0, d_0))}. \quad (48)$$

Remark 17 *The formulation of Theorem 16 in [9] is slightly different. Namely $d := \text{dist}(x_0, y_0) \in [c, 1]$ and the definition of m_k uses closed instead of open balls. However, the proof only uses the fact that d is bounded away from zero and infinity, (which holds for d_0) and it is easy to see that it also works with open balls. Notice that the boundary of any ball is a μ -null set. Therefore [9, Theorem 4.9] can be reformulated as above.*

Before stating Lemma 19, let us recall some basic results given in [9] that we shall use to show the convergence of the *algorithm sequence*.

Lemma 18 ([9] Lemma 4.1) (i) *For every $x \in E$ there exists a sequence $\{x_k\}$ with $x_k \in A_k$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_k = x$.*

(ii) *For every $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$,*

$$A_k \subset A_{k+1}.$$

(iii) *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $x \in A_k$ and $\mathbf{i}_k \in M^k$ be such that $f_{\mathbf{i}_k}(y) = x$ for some $y \in A_1$, then*

$$\mu_k(x) = \mu_k(E_{\mathbf{i}_k}) = \mu(E_{\mathbf{i}_k}). \quad (49)$$

(iv) *The sequence $\{\mu_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ converges weakly to μ and thus*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu_k(A) = \mu(A) \quad (50)$$

for every set A satisfying $\mu(\partial A) = 0$.

Lemma 19 *There exist $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and two sequences $\{x_k\}$, $\{y_k\} \subset A_k$ such that*

$$d_k := \text{dist}(x_k, y_k) \in D_k \quad \forall k \geq k_0, \quad (51)$$

and

$$m_k := \frac{(2d_k)^s}{\mu_k(B'(x_k, d_k))} \rightarrow P^s(E) \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty \quad (52)$$

Proof. Let $x_0, y_0 \in E$ be such that

$$P^s(E) = h(x_0, d_0) \quad \text{with} \quad d_0 := \text{dist}(x_0, y_0) \in [\tilde{c}, \frac{\tilde{c}}{r_{\min}}) \quad (53)$$

(see Corollaries 7 and 8). By Lemma 18 (i) and Theorem 16, we can take two sequences $\{x_k\}, \{y_k\}$ with $x_k, y_k \in A_k \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, such that

$$x_k \rightarrow x_0, \quad y_k \rightarrow y_0, \quad d_k := \text{dist}(x_k, y_k) \rightarrow d_0$$

and

$$m_k := \frac{(2d_k)^s}{\mu_k(B'(x_k, d_k))} \rightarrow P^s(E) \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Observe that D_k is the set of those distances between points of A_k within the interval $[\tilde{c}, \frac{\tilde{c}}{r_{\min}}]$. We claim that, either there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ such that $d_k \in D_k$ for every $k \geq k_0$, or we can construct two other sequences $\{x'_k\}, \{y'_k\}$ with $x'_k, y'_k \in A_k \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, satisfying (51) and (52). It is clear that if $d_0 \in (\tilde{c}, \frac{\tilde{c}}{r_{\min}})$ we are in the first case and the theorem holds. Suppose now that $d_0 = \tilde{c}$ and let $\mathbf{i} = i_1 i_2 \dots \in \mathbb{M}$ be such that $\pi(\mathbf{i}) = x_0$. Then, as $\tilde{c} \leq c$ (see Remark 13), $B'(x_0, d_0) \cap E \subset E_{i_1}$. Therefore, we can apply Lemma 4 (i) to get

$$h(x_0, d_0) = h(f_{i_1}^{-1}(x_0), \frac{d_0}{r_{i_1}}), \quad (54)$$

where $\frac{d_0}{r_{i_1}} = \text{dist}(f_{i_1}^{-1}(x_0), f_{i_1}^{-1}(y_0))$. Let

$$\{d_k^1\} := \{d_k : d_k \geq \tilde{c}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{d_k^2\} := \{d_k : d_k < \tilde{c}\}.$$

and suppose without loss of generality that both subsequences are not finite. For $j = 1, 2$, denote by $\{x_k^j\}$ and $\{y_k^j\}$ the convergent subsequences of $\{x_k\}$ and $\{y_k\}$, respectively, such that $\{d_k^j\} = \{\text{dist}(x_k^j, y_k^j)\}$. Now, by construction there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ such that $\tilde{c} \leq d_k^1 \leq \frac{\tilde{c}}{r_{\min}} \quad \forall k \geq k_0$ and, by the SSC and (44), there exists $k_1 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ such that $x_k^2, y_k^2 \in A_k \cap E_{i_1}$ for all $k \geq k_1$. Hence, by Theorem 16 and (54),

$$\frac{(2\frac{d_k^2}{r_{i_1}})^s}{\mu_k(B'(f_{i_1}^{-1}(x_k^2), \frac{d_k^2}{r_{i_1}}))} \rightarrow h(f_{i_1}^{-1}(x_0), \frac{d_0}{r_{i_1}}) = P^s(E) \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since $\frac{\tilde{c}}{r_{\min}} > \frac{d_k^2}{r_{i_1}} = \text{dist}(f_{i_1}^{-1}(x_k^2), f_{i_1}^{-1}(y_k^2)) \rightarrow \frac{d_0}{r_{i_1}} \in (\tilde{c}, \frac{\tilde{c}}{r_{\min}}]$, there exists $k_2 \geq k_1$ such that $\frac{d_k^2}{r_{i_1}} \in [\tilde{c}, \frac{\tilde{c}}{r_{\min}}] \quad \forall k \geq k_2$. Moreover, by Lemma 18 (ii),

$f_{i_1}^{-1}(x_k^2), f_{i_1}^{-1}(y_k^2) \in A_k \forall k \geq k_2$. This concludes the proof of the theorem as the sequences

$$x'_k := \begin{cases} x_k^1 & \text{if } d_k \geq \tilde{c} \\ f_{i_1}^{-1}(x_k^2) & \text{if } d_k < \tilde{c} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad y'_k := \begin{cases} y_k^1 & \text{if } d_k \geq \tilde{c} \\ f_{i_1}^{-1}(y_k^2) & \text{if } d_k < \tilde{c} \end{cases}$$

satisfy (51) and (52). ■

We state as a lemma the following result extracted from the proof of [9, Theorem 4.13] that we shall need to prove the convergence of $\{\tilde{m}_k\}$.

Lemma 20 *For any sequence $\{(x_k, d_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ in $A \times D$*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\mu_k(B'(x_k, d_k)) - \mu(B(x_k, d_k))| = 0.$$

Proof. Let $\{(x_k, d_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be a sequence in $A \times D$. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ satisfying that $r_{\max}^k < c$, define

$$\begin{aligned} G_k &:= \{E_{\mathbf{i}_k} : \mathbf{i}_k \in M^k \text{ and } E_{\mathbf{i}_k} \subset B'(x_k, d_k)\} \\ P_k &:= \{E_{\mathbf{i}_k} : \mathbf{i}_k \in M^k, E_{\mathbf{i}_k} \cap B'(x_k, d_k) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } E_{\mathbf{i}_k} \cap (E \setminus B'(x_k, d_k)) \neq \emptyset\} \\ R_k &:= \{E_{\mathbf{i}_k} \in P_k : A_k \cap E_{\mathbf{i}_k} \cap B'(x_k, d_k) \neq \emptyset\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} R_k &\subset P_k \\ E \cap B'(x_k, d_k) &= G_k \cup (B'(x_k, d_k) \cap P_k) \\ \mu_k(B'(x_k, d_k)) &= \mu_k(G_k) + \mu_k(R_k) \\ \mu(B(x_k, d_k)) &= \mu(B'(x_k, d_k)) = \mu(G_k) + \mu(B'(x_k, d_k) \cap P_k) \quad \text{and} \\ P_k &\subset B'(x_k, d_k + r_{\max}^k) \setminus B(x_k, d_k - r_{\max}^k) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by (49), $\mu(G_k) = \mu_k(G_k)$ and $\mu(R_k) = \mu_k(R_k)$. This, together with the triangle inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\mu_k(B'(x_k, d_k)) - \mu(B(x_k, d_k))| &= |\mu_k(R_k) - \mu(B'(x_k, d_k) \cap P_k)| \leq \\ &\leq \mu(R_k) - \mu(B'(x_k, d_k) \cap R_k) + \mu((B'(x_k, d_k) \cap P_k) \setminus R_k) \leq \\ &\leq \mu(R_k) + \mu((B(x_k, d_k) \cap P_k) \setminus R_k) \leq \mu(P_k) \leq \\ &\leq \mu(B(x_k, d_k + r_{\max}^k) \setminus B(x_k, d_k - r_{\max}^k)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the lemma holds if $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu(B(x_k, d_k + r_{\max}^k) \setminus B(x_k, d_k - r_{\max}^k)) = 0$. The last is true by the compactness of $E \times [\tilde{c}, \frac{\tilde{c}}{r_{\min}}]$, the continuity of μ and the fact that $\mu(\partial B(x, d)) = 0$ (see [11]). ■

We obtain, as immediate consequence of Lemma 20 and (38), the following result useful in the proof of Theorem 15.

Corollary 21 *Let $\{(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be such that $\tilde{m}_k = h_k(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k) \forall k \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Then*

- i) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |h_k(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k) - h(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k)| = 0$
- ii) *If $\{\tilde{m}_{k_j}\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is a convergent subsequence of $\{\tilde{m}_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$, then $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{m}_{k_j} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} h(\tilde{x}_{k_j}, \tilde{d}_{k_j})$.*

We are now ready to show our main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 15. (46) is immediate since, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ such that $\mu_k(B'(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k)) = \mu(B(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k))$, (45) implies that

$$P^s(E) = \max_{(x,d) \in E \times [\tilde{c}, \frac{\tilde{c}}{r_{\min}}]} h(x, d) \geq h(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k) = h_k(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k) = \tilde{m}_k.$$

We turn now to the convergence. Observe that, although the sequence $\tilde{m}_k$ is not necessarily monotone, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, the argument of h_k ranges on the compact set $A \times [\tilde{c}, \frac{\tilde{c}}{r_{\min}}]$ and hence we can take a convergent subsequence $\{\tilde{m}_{k_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}^+}$. It is enough to show that $\tilde{m} := \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{m}_{k_j} = P^s(E)$. We assume the subsequence $\{\tilde{m}_{k_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ to be the whole sequence and write $\tilde{m} := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{m}_k$. We first show that $\tilde{m} \geq P^s(E)$. Let $\{m_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}^+} := \{h_k(x_k, d_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ as in Lemma 19, then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} m_k = P^s(E)$ and

$$d_k \in D_k \quad \forall k \geq k_0.$$

Hence, if we suppose on the contrary that $\tilde{m} < P^s(E)$, we can find $k_1 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ such that, for any $k \geq k_1$,

$$\tilde{m}_k < m_k \tag{55}$$

in contradiction with (47). With the aim of showing the reverse inequality, assume that $\tilde{m} > P^s(E)$. Then, by Corollary 21 ii), there exists $k_2 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ such that for any $k \geq k_2$

$$P^s(E) < h(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k).$$

Moreover, by (45), we can take $(x_0, d_0) \in E \times [\tilde{c}, \frac{\tilde{c}}{r_{\min}}]$ such that

$$P^s(E) = \max_{(x,d) \in E \times [\tilde{c}, \frac{\tilde{c}}{r_{\min}}]} h(x, d) = h(x_0, d_0) < h(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k)$$

which is a contradiction since $(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k) \in E \times [\tilde{c}, \frac{\tilde{c}}{r_{\min}}]$. This concludes the proof of the theorem. ■

5 Examples

In this section we test the algorithm with several examples that allow us to explain how, besides providing empirical evidence of the precise (or approximate) value of $P^s(E)$, the algorithm suggests a candidate to optimal ball. In many cases, this information can be used to prove rigorously that the value suggested by the algorithm is in fact the true value of $P^s(E)$. We test this with some examples showing first which is the information provided by the algorithm and secondly how this info can be used to prove theorems giving the precise value of $P^s(E)$.

5.1 Testing efficiency: The packing measure of a class of Sierpinski gaskets with SSC.

The algorithm presented in this job is specially useful to find the exact value of the packing measure when the examples under consideration have an *stable behavior* in the sense that both, the ball(s) selected by the algorithm and the values of $\tilde{m}_k$ (see (30)) are the same in consecutive generations. In these cases the results obtained could be considered as an empirical evidence that the inverse density of the selected ball(s) is going to give the precise value of the packing measure. Actually, this ball(s) can be used to show that the value of the packing measure equals to the corresponding $\tilde{m}_k$. This is precisely the method that we are going to follow to prove Theorem 2. We first present a table of results obtained from applying the algorithm to some members of the class of Sierpinski gaskets defined by (6). The stability observed (see Table 1) allow us the obtention of candidates for optimal balls. In the proof of Theorem 2 we make use of these candidates, that are the actual optimal balls, to show that $P^{s(r)}(S_r) = \left(2\frac{1-r}{r}\right)^{s(r)}$ when $r \in (0, \frac{1}{3}]$. The next table shows the results obtained after applying the algorithm to different members of the class S_r when $r \in (0, \frac{1}{3}]$. Keeping the notation given in Section 3, $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ stands for the set of fixed points of the similarities $\{f_1, f_2, f_3\}$, respectively. More precisely, $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\} = \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2})\}$.

From the results given in Table 1, we can conjecture that

$$P^{s(r)}(S_r) = h(x_i, 1-r) = \left(2\frac{1-r}{r}\right)^{s(r)} \text{ where } i = 1, 2, 3;$$

r	$s(r)$	Algorithm output				
$\frac{1}{3}$	1		$\tilde{m}_k$	$[\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{y}_k]$	$\tilde{d}_k$	$B(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k)$
		$k = 0$	6	$[x_1, x_2]$ $[x_2, x_1]$ $[x_3, x_2]$	1	$B(x_1, 1)$ $B(x_2, 1)$ $B(x_3, 1)$
		$1 \leq k \leq 8$	$4 = \left(2^{\frac{1-r}{r}}\right)^{s(r)}$	$[x_1, f_2(x_0)]$ $[x_2, f_1(x_2)]$ $[x_3, f_1(x_3)]$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$B(x_1, \frac{2}{3})$ $B(x_2, \frac{2}{3})$ $B(x_3, \frac{2}{3})$
$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{\log 3}{\log 4}$	$k = 0$	5.1961	$[x_1, x_2]$ $[x_2, x_1]$ $[x_3, x_2]$	1	$B(x_1, 1)$ $B(x_2, 1)$ $B(x_3, 1)$
		$1 \leq k \leq 7$	$4.1368 = \left(2^{\frac{1-r}{r}}\right)^{s(r)}$	$[x_1, f_2(x_0)]$ $[x_2, f_1(x_2)]$ $[x_3, f_1(x_3)]$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$B(x_1, \frac{3}{4})$ $B(x_2, \frac{3}{4})$ $B(x_3, \frac{3}{4})$
$\frac{2}{10}$	$\frac{-\log 3}{\log 0.2}$	$k = 0$	4.815	$[x_1, x_2]$ $[x_2, x_1]$ $[x_3, x_2]$	1	$B(x_1, 1)$ $B(x_2, 1)$ $B(x_3, 1)$
		$1 \leq k \leq 7$	$4.1348 = \left(2^{\frac{1-r}{r}}\right)^{s(r)}$	$[x_1, f_2(x_0)]$ $[x_2, f_1(x_2)]$ $[x_3, f_1(x_3)]$	$\frac{8}{10}$	$B(x_1, \frac{8}{10})$ $B(x_2, \frac{8}{10})$ $B(x_3, \frac{8}{10})$
$\frac{1}{27}$	$\frac{\log 3}{\log 27}$	$k = 0$	3.7798	$[x_1, x_2]$ $[x_2, x_1]$ $[x_3, x_2]$	1	$B(x_1, 1)$ $B(x_2, 1)$ $B(x_3, 1)$
		$1 \leq k \leq 7$	$3.7325 = \left(2^{\frac{1-r}{r}}\right)^{s(r)}$	$[x_1, f_2(x_0)]$ $[x_2, f_1(x_2)]$ $[x_3, f_1(x_3)]$	$\frac{26}{27}$	$B(x_1, \frac{26}{27})$ $B(x_2, \frac{26}{27})$ $B(x_3, \frac{26}{27})$

Table 1: Algorithm output for some members of the class S_r .




Figure 1: Algorithm selected balls for $S_{\frac{1}{3}}$ and $S_{\frac{2}{10}}$.

provided $r \in (0, \frac{1}{3}]$. This conjecture is based on the fact that the algorithm selects in all the cases the three same balls, namely $B(x_1, 1-r)$, $B(x_2, 1-r)$ and $B(x_3, 1-r)$ (see Figure 1), all having inverse density equal to $(2\frac{1-r}{r})^s$. Therefore one can say that there is empirical evidence that the inverse density, $h(x_i, 1-r)$, of any of these balls is going to give the precise value of $P^{s(r)}(S_r)$ when $r \in (0, \frac{1}{3}]$. We turn now to the proof of Theorem 2 that states the above conjecture to be true.

Proof of Theorem 2. The lower bound holds trivially by taking $(x, d) = ((0, 0), 1-r)$ in (37). The upper bound follows from Theorem 1 if the following inequality holds

$$h(x, d) \leq \left(2\frac{1-r}{r}\right)^{s(r)} \quad \forall x \in S_r \text{ and } 1-2r \leq d \leq \frac{1-2r}{r}. \quad (56)$$

Due to the symmetry of the Sierpinski gaskets, we need to show (56) only for $x \in f_1(S_r)$ and $1-2r \leq d \leq \frac{1-2r}{r}$. Moreover, by the geometry of the picture one can see that, for a fixed $d \in [1-2r, \frac{1-2r}{r}]$ and every $x \in f_1(S_r)$,

$$\mu(B(x, d)) \geq \mu(B((0, 0), d)). \quad (57)$$

This is because moving the center of the ball from $(0, 0)$ in any direction within the Sierpinski gasket, can only increase the amount of set S_r lying in the ball. More precisely, for any $1-2r \leq d \leq \frac{1-2r}{r}$ and $x \in f_1(S_r)$,

$$B((0, 0), d) \cap S_r \subset B(x, d) \cap S_r. \quad (58)$$

We now proof (58). Observe that, given $y_i \in f_i(S_r)$, $i \in \{2, 3\}$,

$$\max_{x \in (S_r)_1} \text{dist}(x, y_i) = \text{dist}((0, 0), y_i). \quad (59)$$

Clearly (58) holds if, for any $x \in f_1(S_r)$, $B((0, 0), d) \cap f_i(S_r) \subset B(x, d) \cap S_r$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. It is enough to check this inclusion when $i = 2, 3$ since $1 - 2r > r$ and hence, $B((0, 0), d) \cap f_1(S_r) \subset f_1(S_r) \subset B(x, d) \cap S_r$. Let $y \in B((0, 0), d) \cap f_i(S_r)$, then (59) implies that $\text{dist}(x, y) \leq \text{dist}((0, 0), y) \leq d$ and hence $y \in B((x, d) \cap f_i(S_r))$. This shows that $B((0, 0), d) \cap f_i(S_r) \subset B((x, d) \cap f_i(S_r))$ for $i \in \{2, 3\}$ and concludes the proof of (58), which in turn implies (57). It remains to prove that $h((0, 0), d) \leq \left(2\frac{1-r}{r}\right)^{s(r)}$ for every $1 - 2r \leq d \leq \frac{1-2r}{r}$. By Corollary 8, we need to check the upper bound only when $d \in [1 - 2r, 1]$. We divide the proof in the following two cases:

1. If $d \in [1 - 2r, 1 - r]$ then, $\mu(B((0, 0), d)) = r^{s(r)}$ and hence

$$h((0, 0), d) = \frac{(2d)^{s(r)}}{r^{s(r)}} \leq \left(2\frac{1-r}{r}\right)^{s(r)}.$$

2. If $d \in [1 - r, 1]$, we write

$$[1 - r, 1] = \cup_{k=1}^{\infty} [1 - r + r^{k+1}, 1 - r + r^k]$$

and show that, $h((0, 0), d) \leq \left(2\frac{1-r}{r}\right)^{s(r)}$ for any $d \in [1 - r + r^{k+1}, 1 - r + r^k]$ with $k \geq 1$. Observe that, in this case, $\mu(B((0, 0), d)) \geq r^{s(r)} + 2r^{(k+1)s(r)}$ and thus,

$$h((0, 0), d) \leq \frac{2^{s(r)}(1 - r + r^k)^{s(r)}}{r^{s(r)} + 2r^{(k+1)s(r)}}.$$

So we need to show

$$\frac{(1 - r + r^k)^{s(r)}}{r^{s(r)} + 2r^{(k+1)s(r)}} \leq \frac{(1 - r)^{s(r)}}{r^{s(r)}},$$

or, equivalently,

$$\frac{(1 - r + r^k)^{s(r)}}{(1 - r)^{s(r)}} = \left(1 + \frac{r^k}{1 - r}\right)^{s(r)} \leq \frac{r^{s(r)} + 2r^{(k+1)s(r)}}{r^{s(r)}} = 1 + 2r^{ks(r)}. \quad (60)$$

Let $g_1(t) = (1 + \frac{t}{1-r})^{s(r)}$ and $g_2(t) = 1 + 2t^{s(r)}$, both functions taking the same value at $t = 0$. Then, (60) holds if $g'_1(t) \leq g'_2(t) \forall t \in [0, \frac{1}{3}]$ or, equivalently,

$$\frac{1}{1-r}(\frac{1}{t} + \frac{1}{1-r})^{s(r)-1} \leq 2.$$

The last inequality is true because $r, t \leq \frac{1}{3}$ and $s(r) - 1 \leq 0$ and, therefore

$$\frac{1}{1-r}(\frac{1}{t} + \frac{1}{1-r})^{s(r)-1} \leq \frac{3}{2}(3+1)^{s(r)-1} \leq 2.$$

■

Remark 22 *What happens when $r > \frac{1}{3}$? In these cases we have observed that, if the contractio factors are not bigger than 0.365, then the selected balls are still $B(x_i, 1-r)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. Notice that showing (7) for $r \in [\frac{1}{3}, 0.365]$ requires a modification of the arguments given in the proof of Theorem 2. Namely, as $s(r) \geq 1$, it will be necessary to find the right decomposition of the interval $[1-r, 1]$. Finally, we have also noticed a loss of stability in the numerical results when $r \in (0.365, 0.5)$. Namely, the selected ball varies on a small scale from one iteration to the next, that is, only an approximation of the optimal ball is reached since the center of the selected ball remains fixed but the radius changes slightly (see tables 2 and 3 for the cases $r = 0.37$ and $r = 0.42$).*

5.2 Further examples

1. **Cantor sets in the real line** Let C_r be the linear Cantor set obtained as the attractor of the iterated function system $\{f_1(x) = rx, f_2(x) = 1-r+rx\}$, $x \in [0, 1]$ and $0 < r < \frac{1}{2}$. The numerical results arising from the application of the algorithm to several Cantor sets belonging to the class C_r indicate that the optimal balls are either $B(0, 1-r)$ and $B(1, 1-r)$, or images of these two balls with the same density. More precisely, the pattern observed is that when the contractio factor is smaller than $\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{5}$, then $d = 1-r \leq \frac{c}{r}$ and, since $B(0, 1-r)$ and $B(1, 1-r)$ are admissible balls (see (37)), these are the chosen ones. The situation changes when $r < \frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{5}$, since then $1-r$ is too big to be radius of an admissible ball. In these cases, $B(0, 1-r)$ and $B(1, 1-r)$ are replaced by $f_{i_1(n)}B(0, 1-r)$ and $f_{i_2(n)}(B(1, 1-r))$,

	$\tilde{m}_k = \frac{(2\tilde{d}_k)^s}{\mu_k(B(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k))}$	$[\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{y}_k]$	$\tilde{d}_k = dist(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{y}_k)$
$k = 1$	6.452802	$[x_1, f_1(x_3)]$	0.37
$k = 2$	3.872817	$[x_1, f_2(x_1)]$	0, 63
$k = 3$	3.872817	$[x_1, f_2(x_1)]$	0, 63
$k = 4$	3.872817	$[x_1, f_2(x_1)]$	0, 63
$k = 5$	3.872817	$[x_1, f_2(x_1)]$	0, 63
$k = 6$	3.872817	$[x_1, f_2(x_1)]$	0, 63
$k = 7$	3.872817	$[x_1, f_2(x_1)]$	0, 63
$k = 8$	3.872830	$[x_1, f_{31111111}(x_2)]$	0.630176
$k = 9$	3.872865	$[x_1, f_{311111111}(x_2)]$	0.630065
$k = 10$	3.872849	$[x_1, f_{2111111111}(x_3)]$	0.630024
$k = 11$	3.87283414017915	$[x_1, f_{31111111111}(x_2)]$	0.630009

Table 2: Algorithm output for $S_{0.37}$, $s = \frac{-\log 3}{\log 0.37}$.

	$\tilde{m}_k = \frac{(2\tilde{d}_k)^s}{\mu_k(B(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k))}$	$[\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{y}_k]$	$\tilde{d}_k = dist(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{y}_k)$
$k = 1$	2.125979	$[f_1(x_2), f_2(x_1)]$	0.16
$k = 2$	7.216871	$[x_1, f_{11}(x_2)]$	$(0.42)^2$
$k = 3$	3.659900	$[x_1, f_{131}(x_2)]$	0.287885
$k = 4$	3.670508	$[x_1, f_{1311}(x_2)]$	0.260556
$k = 5$	3.658307	$[x_1, f_{13111}(x_2)]$	0.250391
$k = 6$	3.642973	$[x_1, f_{121111}(x_3)]$	0.246390
$k = 7$	3.633895	$[x_1, f_{1211111}(x_2)]$	0.245905
$k = 8$	3.630715	$[x_1, f_{12111131}(x_1)]$	0.245207
$k = 9$	3.629988	$[x_1, f_{121111321}(x_3)]$	0.246752
$k = 10$	3.629498	$[x_1, f_{1211113323}(x_2)]$	0.246745
$k = 11$	3.629288	$[x_1, f_{13111122322}(x_2)]$	0.246662

Table 3: Algorithm output for $S_{0.42}$, $s = \frac{-\log 3}{\log 0.42}$.

where, for $j = 1, 2$, $\mathbf{i}_j(n)$ is the word formed by the letter j repeated n times and $n = n(r)$. Therefore, the numerical results indicate that the right formula for the packing measure should be

$$\begin{aligned} P^{s(r)}(C_r) &= \frac{|B(x_j, 1-r)|^{s(r)}}{\mu(B(x_j, 1-r))} = \frac{|f_{\mathbf{i}_j(n)}(B(x_j, 1-r))|^{s(r)}}{\mu(f_{\mathbf{i}_j(n)}(B(x_j, 1-r)))} = \\ &= \left(2\frac{1-r}{r}\right)^{s(r)}, \quad j = 1, 2 \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

where $s(r) = \frac{-\log 2}{\log r}$ is the similarity dimension of C_r and $\{x_1, x_2\} = \{0, 1\}$. A previous work by Feng shows that (61) actually holds. In [5] the author obtains by other means a general formula for the packing measure of linear Cantor sets. Notice that (61) coincides with the formula given in the Sierpinski gasket case (see Theorem 2).

Remark 23 *After testing several examples we have noticed that the number of steps needed to observe an stable behavior varies from 1 to 4. If the contractio factors are near 0.5, then it is clear that we cannot expect stability from early iterations. This is due to the big size of the contractio ratios that makes $\tilde{m}_k = h_k(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k)$ (see 47) to be a bad approximation of $h(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{d}_k)$ at early stages. However, even in the worse cases the selected interval is the same from iteration 4th to 15th. Therefore, we can conclude that, empirically, the algorithm is recovering the formula (61) given by Feng in [5].*

2. **Cantor sets in the plane** Let K_r be the attractor of the iterated function system $\Psi = \{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4\}$ where $f_i(\mathbf{x}) = r\mathbf{x} + b_i$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, $\mathbf{x} = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $0 < r < \frac{1}{2}$, $b_1 = (0, 0)$, $b_2 = (1-r, 0)$, $b_3 = (1-r, 1-r)$, and $b_4 = (0, 1-r)$. Let $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ be the set of fix points of the similarities in the system Ψ , i.e., $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\} = \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (1, 1), (0, 1)\}$. The implementation of the algorithm to the family K_r leads to results quite similar to those observed in the Sierpinski gasket case: Whenever $r \leq \frac{1}{4}$, the algorithm selects the same four balls, namely $B(x_i, 1-r)$ where $i = 1, \dots, 4$. This means that the experimental results indicate that the right formula for the packing measure of K_r should be

$$P^{s(r)}(K_r) = \frac{|B(x_i, 1-r)|^{s(r)}}{\mu(B(x_i, 1-r))} = \left(2\frac{1-r}{r}\right)^{s(r)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, 4 \quad (62)$$

$\forall r \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$. Observe that for both, the planar Cantor sets with dimension less than one and the linear Cantor sets, one can argue as in the proof of Theorem 2 to show that (61) and (62) are the corresponding actual formulas for the packing measure of these two families (K_r with $0 < r \leq \frac{1}{4}$ and C_r with $0 < r < \frac{1}{2}$). For example, in the case of K_r with $0 < r \leq \frac{1}{4}$ we still have that, if $d \in [1 - r + r^{k+1}, 1 - r + r^k]$, then $\mu(B((0,0), d)) \geq r^{s(r)} + 2r^{(k+1)s(r)}$ and therefore (60) should also hold. Notice that we have proved (60) for every $r, t \leq \frac{1}{3}$ and $s(r) - 1 \leq 0$, so it remains true when $0 < r \leq \frac{1}{4}$. In the case of planar Cantor sets having dimension bigger than one, our experimental results indicate that there is still a range of contractio factors for which (62) still holds. Namely, $B(x_i, 1 - r)$ is selected whenever we take $r \leq 0.35$ (see Figure 2 for the case $r = \frac{1}{3}$). Actually, in [4] and [3] we can find a proof of (62) for the cases $r = \frac{1}{3}$ and $r \in (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4})$, respectively. In both papers the authors used the classical relation between the packing measure and the upper densities (see, for example, [18]) to obtain the corresponding formulas. Finally, we have noticed that above these values of r the selected ball varies on a small scale from one iteration to the next, meaning that only an approximation of the optimal ball is reached. In these cases the observed selected balls are of the form $f_{\mathbf{i}_j(n)}B(x_j, 1 - r + \epsilon(r))$, where $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $\mathbf{i}_j(n)$ is the word formed by the letter j repeated n times, $n = n(r)$ and $\epsilon(r)$ is a small number depending on r (see Figure 2 for the case $r = 0.4$).




Figure 2: Algorithm selected balls for $K_{\frac{1}{3}}$ and $K_{\frac{4}{10}}$.

The above results allows the following conjecture

Conjecture 24 *Let E_r be the self-similar set associated to a system of contracting similitudes $\Psi = \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_N\}$ satisfying the SSC and such that $\forall i = 1, \dots, N$, $f_i(x) = rx + b_i$, where $r \in (0, \frac{1}{N})$, $x, b_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose that the fixed points of the N similarities of the system are the vertices of an N -regular polygon then*

$$P^{s(r)}(P_r) = \frac{|B(x_i, 1-r)|^{s(r)}}{\mu(B(x_i, 1-r))} = \left(2 \frac{1-r}{r}\right)^{s(r)}$$

Acknowledgement

We want to thank Maria Eugenia Mera for her valuable help with the programming of the algorithm.

References

- [1] Ayer, E. and Strichartz, R. (1999) *Exact Hausdorff measure and intervals of maximal density for Cantor sets*. Trans. Am. Math. Soc. 351, Num. 9, 3725-3741

- [2] Baek, H. K.(2006) *Packing dimension and measure of homogeneous Cantor sets*. Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. 74, no. 3, 443–448.
- [3] Baoguo J.and Zhiwei Z.. (2004) *The packing measure of a class of generalized sierpinski carpet*. Analysis in Theory and Applications, 20, 1, 69-76.
- [4] Baoguo J., Zuoling Z., Zhiwei Z. and Jun L. (2003) *The packing measure of the Cartesian product of the middle third Cantor set with itself* J. Math. Anal. Appl., 288, 424–441.
- [5] Feng, D .(2003) *Exact packing measure of linear Cantor sets*. Math. Nachr. 248/249 , 102–109.
- [6] Feng D. and Hua J. G. (1998) *Some relations between packing premeasure and packing measure*. Bull. Lon. Math. Soc. 31, 665–70.
- [7] Garcia, I. and Zuberan, L.(2012) *Exact packing measure of central Cantor sets in the line*. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 386 , no. 2, 801–812.
- [8] Llorente, M. and Morán, M. (2007), *Self-similar sets with optimal coverings and packings*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 334, 1088-1095.
- [9] Llorente, M. and Moran, M. (2010), *Advantages of the centered Hausdorff measure from the computability point of view* Math. Scand. 107, no. 1, 103-122.
- [10] Llorente, M. and Moran, M. (2012) *An algorithm for computing the centered Hausdorff measures of self-similar sets*. Chaos Solitons Fractals, 45 , no. 3, 246–255.
- [11] Mattila, P. (1982) *On the structure of self-similar fractals*. Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math. 7, no. 2, 189–195.
- [12] Morán M. (2005) *Computability of the Hausdorff and packing measures on self-similar sets and the self-similar tiling principle*. Nonlinearity 18, no. 2, 559–570.
- [13] Saint Raymond, X. ; Tricot, C. (1988) *Packing regularity of sets in n -space*. Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 103, no. 1, 133-145.

- [14] Sullivan, D. (1984), *Entropy, Hausdorff measures old and new, and limit sets of geometrically finite Kleinian groups*. Acta Math. 153 , no. 3-4, 259–277.
- [15] Taylor, S. J. and C. Tricot (1985), *Packing measure and its evaluation for a Brownian path*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 288, 679-699.
- [16] Taylor, S. J. and C. Tricot (1986), *Packing measure of rectifiable subsets of the plane*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 99, 285-296.
- [17] Tricot, C. (1979) *Sur la classification des ensembles boréliens de mesure de Lebesgue nulle*. These de doctorat, Geneve.
- [18] Tricot, C. (1982) *Two definitions of fractional dimension*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 91, 57-74.
- [19] Tricot, C. (2008) *Geometries et mesures fractales: Une introduction*, France, Ellipses, 339 pp.
- [20] Zhou Z. (2000) *A new estimate of the Hausdorff measure of the Sierpinski gasket*. Nonlinearity 13, 479–91.